

APPENDIX 6

Clarifications of the PA/FEIS

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) prepared the PA/FEIS for the Alta East Wind Project (AEWP) in consultation with other agencies, taking into account public comments received during the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process undertaken for the Project. The PA/FEIS described the Proposed Action and alternatives, analyzed the proposed CDCA Plan Amendment and Project decisions, and responded to written comments received during the public review period for the Draft PA/EIS (see PA/FEIS Chapter 5, *Consultation, Coordination, and Public Involvement*, and Chapter 7, *Responses to Comments*). Review of the PA/FEIS by the BLM and others has resulted in the minor corrections and clarifying statements listed below. Revisions to language as it appears in the PA/FEIS are indicated as follows: Quoted language is *italicized*, new language is shown in underscore, deleted language is shown in ~~striketrough~~. None of these minor corrections and clarifying statements affects the adequacy of the underlying NEPA analysis in the PA/FEIS.

- Mitigation Measure 4.16-4 on page 4.16-18 of the PA/FEIS has been revised as follows to clarify submittal of engineering drawings of access road design to Kern County:

MM 4.16-4: Coordination With County Roads Department. *Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits by the County and/or a Notice to Proceed from the BLM, the project proponent shall coordinate with the Kern County Roads Department to implement the following:*

- a. For those portions of the project that will use ~~public~~ County maintained roads, submit engineering drawings of project access road design for the review and approval of the Kern County Roads Department.*
- Mitigation Measure 4.18-5 on page 4.18-21 of the PA/FEIS has been revised as follows to identify specific compensatory land acquisition funds for impacts to views from the Pacific Crest Trail based on a visibility analysis of the AEWP from KOP 1:

MM 4.18-5: Evaluate and Implement PCT Route Enhancement. *In order to mitigate for impacts that do not substantially interfere with the nature and purpose of the PCT, the project proponent shall provide funds for acquisition of land along the PCT corridor. Funds will be used by the project proponent, or transferred to the BLM or a third party, to acquire property of equal value along the trail corridor. Priority will be given to acquisition within the southern Sierra Nevada/Tehachapi portion of the trail. If properties are not available for acquisition, funds may be used for restoration projects of equal value along the trail corridor that will improve visual integrity. ~~consult and coordinate with the U.S. Forest Service, the BLM, and the Pacific Crest Trail Association to develop an off-site mitigation plan for the Pacific Crest Trail. The plan shall be submitted for review and approval to the BLM and U.S. Forest Service prior to BLM issuing a Notice to Proceed and commissioning of the wind turbines. The plan shall identify feasible land acquisition opportunities to protect the PCT corridor and to improve the PCT recreation and scenic opportunities commensurate with the recreation and visual impacts. The provisions shall be designed to apply to those areas where the~~*

~~project would be most visible from the existing trail. If directed by the BLM, in consultation with the U.S. Forest Service, the project proponent shall provide funds for acquisition within one year of issuance of the wind turbine generator building permit Notice to Proceed from BLM.~~

~~Land acquisition is will be based on the concepts developed in the Draft Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail Best Management Practices to Mitigate Scenery Impacts from Conflicting Land Uses (USFS, BLM June 2012). Under these Best Management Practices (BMP), the mitigation ratio for land acquisition is calculated by using the distance of the project from the PCT, the distance along the trail that the project is visible to trail users, and the contrast created by the project to the characteristic scenery. Under the preferred alternative, the closest the project is to the trail is 1.2 miles (middleground distance zone), is visible to trail users for approximately 1.5 miles, and creates a moderate to high contrast to the characteristic scenery. Using this scenario, the ration for land acquisition would be 1:1. Thus, the acres to be acquired off site for mitigation to impacts to 1.8 square miles would be 1,152 acres.~~

~~Under the preferred alternative, 702 acres of land managed by the BLM would be visible from KOP 1. Of the total visible acreage, new structures (wind turbines) would be introduced on 180 acres that have no existing visual intrusions. The area of impacted viewshed would extend well beyond the project footprint. A mitigation ratio of 2:1 is required for this 180-acre area.~~

~~The remainder of the visible acreage (522 acres) is impacted by existing development. Although the project would introduce additional visual contrast into this area, it is considered less substantial due to the presence of existing turbines in the vicinity of the project site. Mitigation is required at a ratio of 1:5 for a 246-acre area that is closer to the trail and in which the bulk of turbine components would be visible. Mitigation at a ratio of 1:10 is required for a 276-acre area that is further from the trail and in which lower portions of the turbines would not be visible due to the topography.~~

~~The total required mitigation would be a fixed fee of \$383,467. This amount is based on the affected acreage ratios (437 acres), the general undeveloped land values in the region of \$650 per acre, and an additional 35% for overhead and acquisition/closing costs.~~